



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,342	12/28/2001	Fergus O'Brien	27795-00025	5883
61060	7590	11/21/2008		
WINSTEAD PC				
P.O. BOX 50784				
DALLAS, TX 75201				
EXAMINER				
STRANGE, AARON N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2453				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/21/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/030,342

Applicant(s)

O'BRIEN ET AL.

Examiner

AARON STRANGE

Art Unit

2453

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8,9,11-13 and 19-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8,9,11-13 and 19-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/19/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant primarily argues that the rejection relies on hindsight (Remarks, 5-7) and that the present invention organizes clusters and the connections between them to provide a "degree of scalability that is wholly surprising and unpredictable" (Remarks, 7-8), apparently arguing that the present invention produced unexpected results.
3. With regard to Applicant's assertion that the rejection relies upon hindsight, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed in the Office action of 5/20/08 (§3), Barthelemy suggests applying small world principles to "information networks" in general (p. 3183, col. 1) and Collins suggests applying small world principles to computer networks in particular (p. 410). Collins also notes that "[a]lthough we are not in a position to design the Internet from scratch, [we can still make] small-world modifications" (p.410). It would have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that the same principles used to improve an existing network could be used to construct an entirely new one as well. The rejection is based on these express suggestions, present in the prior art of record, and does not rely on hindsight.

With regard to Applicant's assertion that one of ordinary skill in the art could not have easily implemented the teachings of Barthelemy and Collins to construct a small

world network since Collins states that "[s]trategies for determining and achieving optimal small-world connectivity remain to be developed" (Remarks, 5), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that Applicant has neither claimed nor disclosed a method of obtaining "optimal small-world connectivity", but merely claims a method/system that constructs a small-world network having an average path length falling in a "predetermined desired range". One of ordinary skill in the art need not know how to construct a network having "optimal" connectivity to construct a network falling within the scope of the present claims.

Furthermore, it is noted that Applicant has provided no evidence or argument showing how or why one of ordinary skill in the art would have had difficulty directly connecting a plurality of cross links between node clusters in a network until the average path length falls within a desired range. An operation as simple as connecting links between nodes would have been well within the range of knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

4. With regard to Applicant's assertion that the claimed invention produces a "degree of scalability that is wholly surprising and unpredictable" and that the combined teachings of Barthelemy, Collins and Attanasio, while providing "pieces of the puzzle", do not provide "an implementation capable of achieving the wholly remarkable results of the present invention" (Remarks, 8), it is noted that Applicant has failed to provide any evidence that the results of the claimed invention were, in fact, unexpected or "remarkable. Barthelemy and Collins teach that small world networks provide

significantly reduced average path length than regular networks, allowing two nodes to be linked in many fewer steps.

Path length (often measured using hop counts) is a well-known metric for approximating the time it will take information to get between two nodes in a computer network. One of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that reducing the average number of between two arbitrary points in a network allows the network to be much larger while maintaining acceptable distances between nodes to keep communication latency within acceptable bounds. Therefore, the teachings of Barthelemy and Collins would have been sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the use of a small world network would dramatically increase the scalability of systems that use computer networks for communication.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 8, 9, 11-13 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barthelemy ("Small World Networks: Evidence for a Crossover Picture") in view of Collins ("It's a small world") further in view of Attanasio et al (US 5,371,852).

7. With regard to claim 8, Barthelemy discloses a method for constructing a small world network, the method comprising:

providing a plurality of vertices (start from a regular network with n vertices each connected to z neighbors, forming neighborhoods)(p. 3181, col. 2)

providing a plurality of cross-links between the vertices (each of the vertices are connected to z neighbors, forming cross links between them)(p. 3181, col. 2);

directly connecting, using the plurality of cross-links, a corresponding plurality of pairs of vertices selected from the plurality of vertices in accordance with a selection process (apply the "rewiring" algorithm)(p. 3181, col. 2) resulting in a formation of a network of said plurality of vertices having a higher clustering coefficient of vertices in comparison with a corresponding randomly-connected network in combination with a lower characteristic path length between the vertices in comparison with a corresponding regularly-connected network (only a few links must be rewired to form a small world network, which maintains neighborhoods [clustering coefficient] like a regular network while reducing the average path length to the same order as a random network)(p. 3180, col. 2, ll. 6-10; p. 3183, col. 1, ll. 21-34); and

wherein the steps of providing the plurality of cross-links and directly connecting the plurality of vertices in accordance with said selection process are repeated until the resulting network comprises a small-world network having an average path length between the plurality of vertices falling within a predetermined desired range, independently of a number of said plurality of vertices (once the links are rewired, the

average path length is calculated; additional links may be rewired [by increasing p] to reduce the average path length as desired)(p. 3182; fig. 2 (a)-(b)).

Barthelemy fails to specifically disclose that the method may be used to construct a scalable computer system wherein the vertices are node clusters each comprising a single switching node and a plurality of computing nodes. However, Barthelemy expressly suggests that the small-world topology may be a promising topology for studies of known problems, including flow in "information networks".

Collins also discloses various properties of small world networks and suggests several applications of small world networks. Collins explicitly suggests providing a few random cross links between nodes along the backbone of the internet, which could reduce the time needed to transfer information via the Internet. In light of these suggestions by Barthelemy and Collins, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had good reason to apply the teachings of Barthelemy to computer networks and solve the problems noted by Barthelemy by implementing a computer system using a small-world architecture. Such a system would maintain a low average path length and high clustering, even for large numbers of nodes, reducing the time needed to exchange information among nodes on the network.

Atanasio teaches configuring a network with a cluster of computers comprising a single switching node (fig. 2; interconnect 110) and a plurality of computing nodes (fig. 2; nodes 105-108 and gateway 109), such that the cluster of computers appears to be a single computer to host computers outside the cluster (Abstract; col. 5, ll. 3-11). Replacing Barthelemy's "vertices" with computer clusters would have been an

advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Barthelemy and Collins since it would have allowed clusters of computers to be interconnected in a small world network, and receive the accompanying benefits.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Barthelemy, Collins and Attanasio to use clustered computer networks to construct a scalable computer system as claimed, since it would have provided more efficient communication between large numbers of nodes by maintaining a low average path length between nodes as the network size increased.

8. Claims 13 and 19 are directed to a "scalable computer system" constructed using the method discussed regarding claim 8. Since performance of the method of claim 8 would result in a scalable computer network as claimed in claims 13 and 19, these claims are rejected under the same rationale as claim 8.

9. With regard to claims 9 and 22, Barthelemy further discloses that the selection process is a random or pseudo-random process (p. 3181, col. 2).

10. With regard to claims 11, 12, 23 and 24 while the system disclosed by Barthelemy shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that the predetermined range of the average path length between the plurality of nodes is less than 2.0, or, more specifically, between 1.5 and 1.7.

However, Barthelemy discloses that adding a few cross-links results in a large decrease in the average path length between nodes (p. 3180, col. 2, ll. 11-15; fig. 1), while maintaining the clustering of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that additional rewired cross-links could have been used, as needed, to reduce the average path length to a desired amount.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the number of cross-links to obtain an average path length less than 2.0, between 1.5 and 1.7, or any other range as desired.

11. With regard to claims 20 and 21, Attanasio further discloses that the switching node comprises a fiber optic switch (col. 7, ll. 25-28). Non-blocking, multi-wavelength optical switches are known types of fiber optic switches, and Applicant admits that such interface blocks were "[c]urrently available" as of the time the invention was made (Spec. 9).

12. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barthelemy ("Small World Networks: Evidence for a Crossover Picture") in view of Collins ("It's a small world") further in view of Attanasio et al. (US 5,371,852) further in view of Brewer (US 5,859,975).

13. With regard to claim 25, while the system disclosed by Barthelemy, Collins and Attanasio shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed regarding claim 8), it fails to disclose that each node has a plurality of interconnected processors.

Brewer discloses that the use of multiple processors in a single node of a distributed system is well-known in the art (Col 1, Lines 26-31). The use of multiple processors in a single node allows that node to process more information than it would be capable with only a single processor.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a plurality of interconnected processors in each node since it would have allowed the nodes to process more information that they would be capable of processing with only a single processor.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON STRANGE whose telephone number is (571)272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2453

/ARIO ETIENNE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457